



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,499	01/23/2006	Zheng Lu	LCS-105/PCT/US	9918
7590 Steven C. Bauman Henkel Corporation 1001 Trout Brook Crossing Rocky Hill, CT 06067				
EXAMINER LOEWE, ROBERT S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/565,499

**Applicant(s)**

LU ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROBERT LOEWE

**Art Unit**

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 19, 22-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-848)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



Art Unit: 1796

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's arguments/remarks, filed on 3/28/08, have been fully acknowledged.

#### ***International Search Report***

JP 06-88025, cited on the international search report as an "X" reference, was relied upon as a prior art reference in a previous Office action but has been withdrawn owing to Applicant's amendments.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the limitation "amino functional silane without alkoxy functionality" of instant claims 1, 22, 24, 28 and 29 constitutes new matter. Applicant's originally filed disclosure recites amino functional silanes only. Nowhere in the original disclosure was the proviso given that the amino functional silane be free of alkoxy groups. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 10 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the limitation "about 95%" constitutes new matter. Applicant's originally filed disclosure only teaches that the non-VOC carriers may be added in amounts "from about 90% to about 99.8% w/w". Nowhere in the disclosure is an amount of 95% taught. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 16 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the limitation "6 hours" constitutes new matter. Applicant's originally filed disclosure only teaches a cure time "between about 2 minutes and about 48 hours". Nowhere in the disclosure is an amount of 6 hours taught. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 24 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the limitation "evaporating a portion of the carrier composition" constitutes new matter. Applicant's originally filed disclosure does not teach this limitation;

Art Unit: 1796

instead teaches applying the compositions to a mold surface and curing, no partial evaporation of the carrier composition is disclosed. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

Claims 22 and 23: Kobayashi et al. teaches a method for preparing a curable mold release coating composition comprising: (a) providing a carrier composition/solvent and (b) mixing the carrier composition/solvent with a curable composition comprising at least one crosslinker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (abstract and examples). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the carrier composition/solvent comprises hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41). Specifically, Kobayashi et al. teaches that the organosilanes [component (C) of Kobayashi et al.] serve to induce cure; therefore, the organosilanes taught by Kobayashi et al. are cross-linking agents. Specific cross-linking agents taught by Kobayashi et al. include amino functional silanes without alkoxy functionality, methyl ethyl ketoxime functional silane, acetoxymethyl functional silanes and tris enoxy functional silanes (4:7-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 15, 19, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

It is first noted that the applied reference teaches some of the claimed non-VOC carriers (5:40-41). However, Kobayashi et al. refers to these components as volatile silicones. However, because the claimed non-VOC siloxanes and the volatile silicones as taught by Kobayashi et al. can be the same, Kobayashi et al., when referring to volatile silicones, also refers to non-VOC carriers as claimed.

Claims 1, 28 and 30: Kobayashi et al. teaches a curable composition comprising a curable component which is comprised of a polyfunctional siloxane and at least one crosslinker (abstract). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the curable composition can be used for mold-release applications (5:63). It therefore follows that Kobayashi et al. teaches "a curable mold release composition" as stated in the claim preamble. Kobayashi et al. further teaches the addition of component (C) (4:7-29) and additional silane coupling agents (4:52-5:24 and claim 8 of Kobayashi et al.). Specifically, Kobayashi et al. teaches that the organosilanes [component (C) of Kobayashi et al.] serve to induce cure; therefore, the organosilanes taught by Kobayashi et al. are cross-linking agents. Specific cross-linking agents taught by Kobayashi et al. include amino functional silanes **without alkoxy functionality**, methyl ethyl ketoxime functional silane, acetoxymethyl functional silanes and tris enoxy functional silanes (4:7-22).

While Kobayashi et al. is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Kobayashi et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). “Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 2: Kobayashi et al. teaches that mixed solvent systems/carriers may be used (examples section). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the solvents may be volatile.

Claim 3: Kobayashi et al. teaches a moisture-curable composition (abstract).

Claims 4 and 5: While Kobayashi et al. is silent with regards to gloss values of the composition, Kobayashi et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or



Art Unit: 1796

claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). “Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 6 and 8: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent can be hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41).

Claim 11: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent does not react with the curable component (5:24-42).

Claim 15: Because Kobayashi et al. teaches some of the same non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent as the instant application, it inherently follows that Kobayashi et al. teaches that the composition of instant claim 1 has a room temperature solvent evaporation range falling in the range of instant claim 15.

Claim 19: Kobayashi et al. teaches the presence of a moisture cure-accelerating catalyst (4:30-51).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227) as applied to instant claim 1.

Art Unit: 1796

Kobayashi et al. teaches the composition of instant claim 1, as described above.

Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the amount of solvent which may be added can be up to 90%. While Kobayashi et al. does not teach that the amount of solvent can be about 95% or greater, the adjustment of solvent is a result-effective variable. The courts have stated that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (i.e., does not require undue experimentation). *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. “Discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.” *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Note too MPEP 2144.05 which states that “differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical”. In the instant case, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to adjust the amount of solvent required in the compositions taught by Kobayashi et al. and would have been motivated to do so in order to adjust the viscosity/workability of the composition. Further, no disincentive is provided by Kobayashi et al. to employ solvents in amounts greater than 90% and Applicant's have not shown the concentration of solvent to be critical to the invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227) as applied to instant claim 1.

Kobayashi et al. teaches the composition of instant claim 1, as described above. While Kobayashi et al. does not teach that the composition of instant claim 1 has an uncatalyzed cure time of from about 2 minutes to about 6 hours, a chemical composition and its properties are

Art Unit: 1796

inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established."

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

Claim 24: Kobayashi et al. teaches a method for preparing a mold release coating comprising: (a) applying a carrier composition/solvent which may comprise hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41) and a curable component comprising a combination of at least one cross-linker selected from amino functional silanes **without alkoxy functionality**, methyl ethyl ketoxime functional silane, acetoxymethyl functional silanes and tris enoxy functional silanes (4:7-22) and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (abstract) and allowing the composition to cure (examples). Because Kobayashi et al. teaches that the compositions are useful in mold release applications, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the compositions taught by Kobayashi et al. onto a mold surface and cure the composition; the motivation coming from the simple statement that the compositions taught by Kobayashi et al. are useful for mold release applications. The limitation "evaporating a portion of the carrier composition" would be implicitly met during the curing process owing to the volatile nature of the solvents taught by Kobayashi et al.

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 25: While Kobayashi et al. is silent in regards to curing so as to achieve gloss values as claimed in instant claim 25, Kobayashi et al. does teach the same process and composition as claimed in instant claim 24. It therefore follows that the cured compositions would have the same properties as claimed because Kobayashi et al. teaches the same composition (vide supra).

Claims 1-5, 11-13, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stein (US Pat. 6,403,105, cited on the international search report as an "X" reference).

Claims 1, 12-13 and 17: Stein teaches a curable silicone foul release coating composition comprising a curable component which is comprised of a polyfunctional siloxane which satisfies the structural and physical property limitations of instant claims 12 and 13 (2:9-36) and at least one crosslinker such as methyltriacetoxysilane (2:55-62). Stein further teaches a non-volatile organic carrier/non-volatile silicone fluid (3:28-62).

While Stein is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Stein does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by

Art Unit: 1796

identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 2: Stein further teaches that other solvent systems may be added such as toluene or xylene (4:56-61).

Claim 3: Stein teaches a moisture-curable composition (2:42-54).

Claims 4 and 5: While Stein is silent with regards to gloss values of the composition, Stein does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). “Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 11: Stein further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/silicone fluid does not contain silanol groups (abstract).

Claim 19: Stein teaches the presence of a moisture cure-accelerating catalyst (2:42-54).

Claims 1, 3-5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yorkgitis et al. (US Pat. 5,187,015, cited on the international search report as an "X" reference).

Claims 1 and 11: Yorkgitis et al. teaches a curable silicone ice release coating composition comprising a curable component which is comprised of a polyfunctional siloxane [component (a) of Yorkgitis et al.] and an organohydrogenpolysiloxane crosslinker [component (b) of Yorkgitis et al.]. Yorkgitis et al. further teaches a non-functional polysiloxane [component (d) of Yorkgitis et al.].

While Yorkgitis et al. is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Yorkgitis et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." Further, if it is the applicant's position that

Art Unit: 1796

this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 3: Yorkgitis et al. teaches a heat curable composition which cures via hydrosilation (abstract).

Claims 4 and 5: While Yorkgitis et al. is silent with regards to gloss values of the composition, Stein does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1-11, 14-16, 18-20 and 22-25 (Kobayashi et al.) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, Applicant's argue that

Art Unit: 1796

Kobayashi et al. does not teach or suggest Applicant's crosslinker either generally or specifically. It is noted in the 103(a) rejection above that the crosslinkers as claimed are in fact, explicitly taught by Kobayashi et al.

Applicant's amendments to independent claims 1, 22 and 24 effectively overcomes the 103(a) rejections of Gantner et al. and Horie et al. as neither Gantner et al. nor Horie et al. teach the specific silane crosslinkers of the amended instant claims.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claim 21 is allowed. Specifically, Kobayashi et al. does not teach amino-functional silazane crosslinkers. Kobayashi et al. only teaches silazane crosslinkers, such as that on (4:18 when Y is *N*-butylamino, resulting in a Si-N functionality). Amino-functional silazane crosslinkers, although known in the art, are far less common crosslinkers and it would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the limitations of instant claim 21 using the teachings of Kobayashi et al., either when taken alone or in combination.

Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Specifically, none of the applied prior art reference, or those cited on the previously filed PTO-892 form teach or suggest a mold release composition which anticipates or renders obvious the limitations of instant claim 26. Kobayashi et al. teaches the limitations of independent claim 24 but the polyfunctional siloxane employed therein is a silicone **resin** which is not terminally substituted by hydroxyl groups. None of the previously applied prior art satisfy the limitations of instant claim 24 (of which claim 26 depends) and therefore do not anticipate



Art Unit: 1796

nor render obvious, the limitations of claim 26. Claim 26 is directed to a substantially linear polydimethylsiloxane having hydroxyl groups which is inherently different than the resins taught by Kobayashi et al. The examples taught by Kobayashi et al. only employ 15% or 20% D units (or  $R_2SiO_{2/2}$  units) the remainder being T units (or  $RSiO_{3/2}$ ).

Claims 27 and 29 would be allowable over the applied prior art provided Applicants overcome the 112, first paragraph rejection of these claims (vide supra). Specifically, removal of the limitation "without alkoxy functionality" in line 2 of claim 27 and in line 6 of claim 29 would overcome the 112, first paragraph rejection above.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1796

*Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 AM to 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
9-Apr-08

/Randy Gulakowski/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796